

12/15/69

Dear Howard,

Your letters of the 9th and 10th have valuable enclosures. The dishonesty of the panel had been established. That they write to you I attribute to your years. You have done very well. The important thing is the Carnes letter confirming what I've long expected and looked for without finding, the existence of separate reports. I'll carry this further and keep you informed. This is where we may be able to nail them in court. This is the first indication of which I know of these things, which I was sure had to be the case but about which I was unwilling to make requests without proof.

I read your letters and the enclosures when the mail came. I answer now rather in haste the other points. The whole thing, as you may remember I emphasized in PM III, is semantics. The panel, did, in fact, report the discrepancies they found. Maybe not all of them, but several very important ones. They are in the clear on that. They examined everything out of context, so they are in the clear on that. They took other than the Commission's medical conclusions and called them the Commission's medical conclusions, so they whistle past that graveyard. The absence of any by A-P projections is obvious from the list. I clobbered them for a silence on that in PM III.

Dick can better inform you about the dispersal of fragments, but I'd be included to believe their resting place depended on a number of factors, one being energy, another being deflection, etc. There is no doubt whatever bullet or bullets were used had to hit bone. As soon as I spotted both acknowledgements on fragments I phoned Cyril, who said that, with the kind of bullet they postulate, there is no alternative. Incidentally, he told us exactly what he told you prior to court last January, but then he asked Bud and me not to use it. His letter clears this up.

They will not admit it, but the panel was restricted. The letters I have are not to me but to others. ~~was~~ I have them under restrictions. I know one restriction but am pledged to confidence on it.

Mernes letter: reread it carefully. He talks only about the cause of death, not what happened....If Morgan is right, the shot was from the front, the rear wound had to have been of exit, of there was a shot from behind the president in the paving or somewhere. Or I am wrong in my approximate of the 7th cervical vert. That is higher than what I have established as the point of this wound, rear, that is. Of course, with but one projection, there is no way of knowing if one fragment masked others....The last sentence in Fisher's second paragraph may help hang him. Notice that all the bums failed to indicate to you the extent of fragmentation. How man, how large....We also have reason to believe the panel members may have copies of their work before the DJ went to work on it (Carnes 11/17). We'll see what Morgan says....Hoover letter. Isn't it wonderful to be God? And infallible! I've had no answer to my inquiry about special pictures. If I do not get it, we'll add that to the suit.

Frazier's WC testimony is even more explicit. Use WW as an index to it. He said it had not marks on it at all, and even coarse cloth or leather would have marked 399....That is not a high velocity bullet. Medium only. Frazier heard this false description just some long and then had to correct it.

Joy: he took the Commission as face value and worked backward, no more. I do not subscribe to much of his belief, but I sent it to you because some of it is interesting. However, it is possible to argue if the Commission is right the shot had to have come from a direction ending at the garage. I've filed the corres. under panel if we refer to it again. There I have letters r